Reviewer’s report

Title: Community Readiness Assessment for Obesity Research: Pilot Implementation of the Healthier Families Program

Version: 0 Date: 11 Jul 2017

Reviewer: G Middleton

Reviewer's report:

I enjoyed reviewing this manuscript. In the main, this is well written and does managed to focus (to some extent) on quite a novel approach to accessing key stakeholder assessment, opinion and perspectives before implementation of a prospective community-based childhood obesity prevention programme. I would like you to work on the following key items which correspond to a 'major revision' to your original submission:

1) Decide on whether this article is about producing a toolkit for assessment / reporting results from a feasibility assessment. Currently, there is limited evidence of a useable or suitable toolkit in this article for others to follow so I would suggest going with the latter.

2) A greater connection to the childhood obesity prevention literature in the early stages which develops a sense of a real necessity to investigate this area.

3) Additional method detailing and precision, including further description on the grounded theory approach taken with the qualitative data

4) Improvement in the quality of presenting and reporting results and data.

More specific elements for adjusting and considering are as follows:

TITLE

- Theory-driven toolkit?...after reading this article I'm not sure this piece of work eludes to a 'toolkit' as such. There is little precision and detail with simple referral to previous authors of the CFIR and little attention is paid to the survey instrument utilised......This article refers to reporting the early stages of assessment of feasibility in multiple areas which is perfectly fine to publish - but this should be the focus given the data contained and the emphasis of the purpose on page 5, line 50. It is likely the title needs to change.... Perhaps 'Early assessment and opportunity in the Healthier Families Program; use of a CFIR for guiding intervention development and suitability/capability' would be more appropriate (or along those lines).
ABSTRACT:
- Background: First sentence is awkward and not necessary. Reform or remove.
- Methods: Excessive use of 'we' - state what happened directly; "a survey was conducted with x" or "X semi-structured interviews were conducted with"
- Methods: Include the type of qualitative methods used to analyse the data.
- Results: you need to represent the data here, not just a narrative account - so questionnaire results should be shown here along with the themes (highlighted)
- Conclusion: remove the gap between 'explicitly' and 'translates'
- Conclusion: First sentence is awkward. Reform content, possibly two sentences instead.
- Conclusion: Needs to address the decision made where the areas were accepted or rejected based on the mixed-method results. No indication of this is given here.

BACKGROUND:
- General comment: Referencing style in the main text here is incorrectly presented. Full stops must occur after the use of brackets
- General comment: I don't feel that there is enough justification and literature attached to this early part to really outline why you should study this area. The literature and reference list has scope to include further authors. You should try and improve the connection with what you are doing and the literature in the area. I disagree with the statement in Line 33 of page 4 claiming "the field of implementation science for these behavioural interventions is nascent". It possibly was 7 years ago, the references used here to support this statement are dated and since then there has been a plethora of implementation work on childhood/obesity prevention programmes. See Van Der Kleij, R. and associated authors in recent years. Specifically, Van Der Kleij, R. M., Crone, M. R., Paulussen, T. G., van de Gaar, V. M., & Reis, R. (2015). A stitch in time saves nine? A repeated cross-sectional case study on the implementation of the intersectoral community approach Youth At a Healthy Weight. BMC Public Health, 15(1), 1032. AND Van der Kleij, R. M. J. J., Crone, M. R., Reis, R., & Paulussen, T. G. W. M. (2016). Critical stakeholder determinants to the implementation of intersectoral community approaches targeting childhood obesity. Health Education Research, 31(6), 697-715.
Secondly, I think you should outline a rationale (possibly principles) for 'community-based' work and why this type of approach is viable/adopted. See King, L., Gill, T., Allender, S. and Swinburn, B. (2011) Best practice principles for community-based prevention: development, content and application. Obesity Reviews, 12, 329-338 AND also work by Christina D. Economos on community interventions.

- Lines 17 - 20, page 3: CFIR application to various contexts needs specific references attached…..i.e. which study looked at mental health? / obesity? / Healthcare delivery?....

- Line 22, page 3: remove the word 'toolkit' - limited outline of the tools necessary to conduct this. The start of this sentence needs to be reformed.

- Line 29, page 4: obesity stats need references and dating

- Line 44 - 45, page 4: 'leveraging the strengths of the built environment'…?....what does mean? - this needs either exploring or a less dramatic outline.

- Line 50 - 51: Now, if this is the real purpose then this should be reflective in the title?

- Line 55: another mention of a 'toolkit'

METHOD:

- Initial section requires a suitable sub-heading - Design, recruitment and ethics?

- Line 63/65, page 5: use of 'we' - write directly.

- Line 71, page 6: requires a statement which identifies that "ethical approved was granted by"…..

- Lines 77, page 6: How many parks and rec centres expressed interest?......how many were followed up with phone calls?....and how many accepted participation? ......needs to be detailed explicitly.

- Line 81, page 6: delete the word 'possible'

- Line 87 - 88: How many staff were eligible?....how many were included and perhaps how many ineligible for what reason? To enhance precision, you should report age, and gender of the participants here, at least.

- Line 90 - 91, page 6: "(items available on request)"….this should be considered as a supplementary item.
- Line 96, page 7: a summarised score from the questionnaire is possible and should be used alongside the average score.

- Lines 99 - 100, page 7: How many staff members were interviewed from the ones which were invited?... To enhance precision, you should report age, and gender of the participants here, at least.

- Line 105: Report the average time of the interviews alongside the time range.

- Line 111: "(usually the mother)"....this is far too casual. Report how many mothers and fathers or other answered the phone interview. To enhance precision, you should report age, and gender of the participants here, at least.

- Line 123: delete 'we'

- Line 136: Authors mention Grounded-theory but need to elude more on what this entailed in the analysis. The stages involved, the members of the research team and any processes of validation utilised.

RESULTS:

- General comment: This section should have sub headings. Perhaps 'Survey results' and 'Interview Data'

- Line 154: recruited participants should occur earlier it he document; Methods.

- Line 156-157: numbers of leadership staff and other roles should be explicitly represented (n / %)

- Lines 166 - 172: this needs to refer to a table which shows the results to the reader. Each state's individual average results, along with an overall average score should be represented. Additionally, consider an average summarised Likert score for this instrument.

- Page 11: at the start of this section, there is a necessity to highlight briefly how the qualitative work is represented in the following text. A good example of this is found in: Middleton, G., Henderson, H., & Evans, D. (2014). Implementing a community-based obesity prevention programme: experiences of stakeholders in the north east of England. Health promotion international, 29(2), 201-211. Use bold, italics and other to highlight key parts.

- Pages 11 to 17: The qualitative results require more precision to be at a publishable standard in this journal. You need to highlight the participant number in the study alongside the quotes as the reader is then confident that many voices are been represented the quotes
shown. You should also consider further details, i.e. staff role (i.e. senior leader/practitioner etc.) / age / gender. Again, see example above/previous comment.

- Page 18: the final section in the results should form part of the discussion

DISCUSSION:

- Lines 388 - 390, page 19: the final sentence could be better prepared and possibly without the words 'as' and 'we'

- Page 20, referencing errors - brackets, and full stop issue.

- Page 23, final sentence should also state that perhaps those with greatest need for the program may not have come forward.

REFERENCES:

- The references need checking against the Journal's requested system.
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